

money, which is an additional cost that has not yet been recognized by the President's proposal. This brings us, of course, to the notion of how much money will there be for educational reform in this administration.

Everyone wants education reform. We are about to embark on a process of debate and deliberation that will lead, I believe, rather quickly, to a new reauthorization. But whatever we do depends upon how much we are willing to support this legislation with real resources. The President last week announced he is proposing a \$4.6 billion increase in education spending which, by his calculation, will be an 11.5-percent increase in educational spending in our budget.

Let's look a little more closely at those numbers. First, the President's proposal disregards the fact that we have already advanced funded \$2.1 billion in last year's appropriation for the coming year. So you have to, I think, fairly, subtract that \$2.1 billion we have already committed in terms of evaluating how much extra money is going to education. When you do that, you find out the increase is not 11.5 percent but it is 5.7 percent, about \$2.4 billion extra.

You also have to put this in context. That is a 5.7-percent increase, which would be less than what we have done in the last 4 out of 5 years. So one can ask, where is all this extra money? Where is this massive commitment, this bold innovation to fix American education? Where is it? Indeed, if you look back over the last 5 years, we have been averaging up to 13-percent increases in educational spending. We need the money as well as the rhetoric. I hope whatever we do legislatively in terms of authorization we match with robust appropriations.

There is another aspect of the budget with respect to education. This educational increase is not solely devoted to elementary and secondary education, because we also have a significant support system for higher education. When you look at that, the money available just for elementary and secondary education in the President's proposal is about \$1.6 billion. Again, that is not the robust, huge sums that we need to start an educational revolution in conjunction with the States.

If you look at the President's proposal, his commitment to Reading First, which is his literacy program, is \$900 million. That is far above what we are spending for literacy now. If that commitment is made, then less than \$1 billion would be available for all the other programs, including title I, new testing provisions, teacher quality, safe schools, and afterschool programs.

So we really have to ask ourselves, is there anything beyond the rhetoric, beyond the rhetoric?

Are there resources that are going to go into this educational reform? If we

don't commit the money, then this will be an exercise that will be ineffective in addressing the reality of the public education problem in this country.

I believe we have to have real education reform. I believe we can do it. We should build on the success of the past. We should recognize that we already have in place accountability provisions of title I schools upon which we can build. But we also have to do other things such as reinvigorate our direct support of library materials. We have to ensure that there is effective parental involvement. We have to provide teachers with sustained, effective, and intensive mentoring and professional development, as well as provide principals with effective leadership training. We have to help schools and communities work together to address not just the educational challenges of children but some of the health care and social challenges that detract from their education. We can do this, and we should do this.

I hope over the next several weeks and months, throughout the deliberations on the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, we will come together on an elementary and secondary education development plan that will be significant and meaningful, that will be built on our past success, and that will assist States and localities, and that we will find the funds necessary to translate our words into deeds. By doing so, we will realize educational improvement in America and ensure well-educated young people who can not only man the increasingly complex positions in our economy but continue to be citizens who will sustain and move the country forth.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In my capacity as a Member from the State of Wyoming, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the quorum call. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate stands in recess until the hour of 2:15 p.m.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 12:46 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m.

Whereupon, the Senate, at 2:15 p.m., reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. INHOFE).

#### MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

In my capacity as a Senator from the State of Oklahoma, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### BASE CLOSURE ROUNDS

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I have a bill at the desk, and I ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 397) to amend the Defense Base Closure Realignment Act of 1990 to authorize additional rounds of base closures and realignments under that act in 2003 and 2005, to modify certain authorities relating to closures and realignments under that Act, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. MCCAIN pertaining to the introduction of S. 397 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWNBACK). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### NATIONAL ENERGY SECURITY ACT OF 2001

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise to congratulate my colleague, Senator MURKOWSKI, for his efforts in developing the National Energy Security Act of 2001. This act represents a collection of critically important actions; actions that can move the Nation beyond the almost perpetual energy crises that we've experienced in the last few years.

Our Nation has not followed or even developed a comprehensive energy strategy for far too long. We've all paid the price for that omission. Major changes in energy availability and prices are devastating the lives of many of our citizens.

We have seen oil prices gyrate in the last two years by over three times. At one extreme, we destroyed much of our ability to develop new oil and gas wells. At the other extreme, we impacted the Nation's economy. And throughout the last few years, we have prohibited exploration and utilization of public lands that could have been impacting some of our most critical shortages.

Natural gas prices have more than tripled just this year in many parts of the country. The impact on millions of our citizens has created another major crisis.

We have seen the economy of California, the sixth largest economy when compared to all the nations of the world, brought to its knees by the recent energy shortages. Blackouts have struck in unpredictable patterns, disrupting lives. Unfortunately, California is only the first of many areas that are likely to be impacted by the lack of past coherent policy.

It has been terribly frustrating to me to recognize that most of these problems were caused by our own actions, or lack of actions. We have had help falling into these traps, of course, from OPEC for example. But much of these problems are completely predictable. Actions could and absolutely should have been taken to drastically mitigate the severity of the impacts.

I appreciate that Senator MURKOWSKI has taken care in his bill to recognize and emphasize that there is no one "silver bullet" to solve our nation's energy problems. His bill creates opportunities for all of the major energy sources to maximize their contribution to our nation's energy needs; that's the only credible approach to the severity of the current issues.

His bill recognizes that no single energy source represents a vast untapped resource, ready for immediate exploitation. It recognizes that solutions have to include options that impact our needs in the near term, like more natural gas and safe pipelines, as well as approaches that have much longer lead times, like nuclear power and renewables. And while natural gas enables relatively near term impacts with only modest pollution concerns, it is a finite resource and any credible national energy policy has to address a future without readily obtained supplies of natural gas.

Solutions have to build on our existing major national energy providers, like the coal and nuclear plants that provide more than 70 percent of our electricity today. And where these large providers have risk areas, like air emissions from coal and a credible national strategy for spent nuclear fuel, we must work diligently to address the risk areas. Where the past administration argued that these risks meant we should minimize the contribution from these sources, we should instead face the reality that these sources represent some of our major national strengths and end biases against their success.

The days of arguing for massive research and incentives only for one single source of energy and only for improved efficiency, as if they alone can solve our nation's long term energy needs, must be put far behind us. They need to be recognized for what they are, important components of a coherent

national energy strategy, and absolutely not a "silver bullet."

This National Energy Security Act addresses virtually all of these widely divergent, but critically important, areas of national policy. I enthusiastically support the act as a vitally necessary step in achieving the energy stability that our citizens demand.

In selected areas, like coal and nuclear, additional bills may prove useful to target actions on these specific sources. I'm working on such a bill for nuclear energy, and Senator BYRD has a legislative thrust for clean coal. These bills can build on the National Energy Security Act and strengthen it in some key areas.

I salute the efforts of the chairman of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee for his untiring efforts to advance this bill. It's not easy to include in one package a set of initiatives that impact all of the major sources of our Nation's energy. From new incentives for oil and gas exploration, to improved pipeline safety, to creation of vitally needed new domestic oil fields, to major expansion of our current woefully inadequate clean coal programs, to strong support for renewables, and to measures to ensure that nuclear energy remains a viable and strong option for our Nation's energy needs—this bill covers the whole range.

I'm proud to join Senator MURKOWSKI as a cosponsor of his National Energy Security Act of 2001 and urge my colleagues to join in supporting this key initiative.

#### NOMINATION OF JOSEPH ALLBAUGH

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, on February 15, 2001 the Senate voted 91-0 to confirm Mr. Joseph Allbaugh to be Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency. I was absent from this vote due to a pre-scheduled surgery that afternoon. Had I been in the Chamber on February 15, I would have voted for Mr. Allbaugh, and my vote would not have affected the outcome on this unanimous demonstration of support for this confirmation. I look forward to working with Mr. Allbaugh at his post at FEMA. This agency is the critical link in the ability of our communities to prepare for and recover from natural disasters which inevitably strike our nation.

#### THE CHILD CITIZENSHIP ACT OF 2000

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, today marks a special day in the lives of tens of thousands of American families. Families who have adopted children from other nations, providing them with safe environments, good food, a good education, and most importantly, loving homes.

Traditionally, adoptive families have had to endure a lengthy and expensive

bureaucratic process, and navigate through a daunting maze of paperwork, as they have tried to secure U.S. citizenship for their foreign-born adopted children. All that changed first thing this morning when the Child Citizenship Act of 2000 took effect. This important act of Congress, which passed the Senate unanimously last October, cleared the way today for approximately 75,000 children adopted from abroad to become Americans. When these children went to sleep last night, they were in naturalization limbo. When they woke up this morning, they were citizens of the United States of America. I send my warmest welcome to these new young Americans.

In some cases, adoptive parents were not aware of the need to file applications for citizenship for their adopted children. Many of these children grew up to discover they were not considered U.S. citizens. Some have faced the possibility of having to return to a country they have never known. The Child Citizenship Act of 2000 corrected this injustice.

Today, families in Colorado and across this Nation, celebrate the automatic citizenship of foreign-adopted children who meet the requirements outlined in the act. For the O'Neil family of Englewood, Colorado among many such families across the state and our nation, it is a day of great joy.

Today is a day when we greet many new U.S. citizens. I wish to extend my congratulations to our newest and youngest citizens and their families, as well as to my colleagues who worked so diligently to make this day possible.

#### TRIBUTE TO ALAN CRANSTON

Mr. CLELAND. Mr. President, one of the first times I ever came to the Dirksen Senate Office Building, a location where I now have my Senate office, was on December 12, 1969, some 20 months after my injury in Vietnam, when I was summoned to appear before the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs about how the Veterans Administration was handling returning Vietnam war veterans. That meeting was chaired by a tall, lean Senator from California named Alan Cranston and it was the start of a three decade friendship. Thus, in 1974 after experiencing what hopefully will prove to be my only electoral defeat, in the Democratic Primary for Lieutenant Governor of Georgia, one of the first people I turned to was Senator Cranston, who generously accepted my offer to come out to California to campaign for his successful re-election. Then, after the General Election, he came to my aid by serving as guest-of-honor at a fund-raising dinner to pay off my campaign debt. And to top it off, Senator Cranston helped me get a job as a special investigator for the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee, which is where I was serving